

REMARKS

Examiner B. Kebede is thanked for the thorough examination and search of the subject Patent Application.

All Claims are believed to be in condition for Allowance, and that is so requested.

Reconsideration of Claims 1-15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Tsuji et al (JP/05160019) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) is requested based on the following remarks.

Applicant agrees that Tsuji et al describes a method to shape the sidewalls of a patterned resist film. However, there appears to be no motivation to combine the teachings of Tsuji et al with Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA). Tsuji et al does not teach or suggest a motivation to add steps useful for backside grinding as shown in Claim 1:

. . . applying a protective tape overlying said passivation layer and said passivation openings; and

removing said protective tape wherein said gradually sloping sidewalls on said passivation openings allow said protective tape to be completely removed without leaving adhesive residue in the manufacture of the integrated circuit device."

Further, AAPA does not teach nor suggest using a method of modifying the sidewall profile of a patterned photo resist to achieve an optimal passivation sidewall profile. In addition, Applicant notes that the purpose of the method of Tsuji et al is to create an optimal profile on the resist 3 for sputter etching the underlying layer 2 without generating a modified resist byproduct. By comparison, Applicant's claimed invention, as recited particularly in Claim 1, forms gradually sloping sidewalls on said passivation openings. It is this feature that allows the protective tape to be removed without residue.

In addition to the above observations, Applicant notes that the teachings of Tsuji et al appear unrelated to Applicant's claimed invention. Tsuji et al does not appear to attempt creation of an optimal profile for the film 2 underlying the photoresist layer 3. It is not clear to the Applicant how one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would be

motivated to combine the teachings of Tsuji et al with AAPA to perform the claimed invention.

Therefore, Applicant submits that there is no motivation found in the teachings of Tsuji et al or in AAPA to combine the teachings of Tsuji et al and of AAPA. It would not have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of Tsuji et al and those of AAPA. Therefore, the rejection of Claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Tsuji et al (JP/05160019) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) is requested. Further, Claims 2-8 and 10-15 comprise patentably distinct, further limitations on Claims 1 and 9 and should not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Reconsideration of Claims 1-15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Tsuji et al (JP/05160019) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) is requested based on the above remarks.

Reconsideration of Claims 16-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art

(AAPA) in view of Tsuji et al (JP/05160019) is requested based on the following remarks.

As in the case above, Applicant agrees that Tsuji et al describes a method to shape the sidewalls of a patterned resist film. However, there appears to be no motivation to combine the teachings Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) with those of Tsuji et al. Tsuji et al does not teach or suggest a motivation to add steps useful for backside grinding. Further, AAPA does not teach nor suggest using a method of modifying the sidewall profile of a patterned photo resist to achieve an optimal passivation sidewall profile. In addition, Applicant notes that the purpose of the method of Tsuji et al is to create an optimal profile on the resist 3 for sputter etching the underlying layer 2 without generating a modified resist byproduct. By comparison, Applicant's claimed invention, as recited particularly in Claim 1, forms gradually sloping sidewalls on said passivation openings. It is this feature that allows the protective tape to be removed without residue.

Therefore Applicant submits that there is no motivation found in the teachings of Tsuji et al or in AAPA to combine the teachings of AAPA and of Tsuji et al. It would not have been

TSMC-00-166

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to have combined the teachings of AAPA and those of Tsuji et al. Therefore, the rejection of Claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Tsuji et al (JP/05160019) is requested. Further, Claims 17-20 comprise patentably distinct, further limitations on Claim 16 and should not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Reconsideration of Claims 16-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) in view of Tsuji et al (JP/05160019) is requested based on the above remarks.

Applicant has reviewed the prior art made of record and not relied upon and agrees with the Examiner that while the references are of general interest, they do not apply to the detailed Claims of the present invention.

Allowance of all Claims is requested.

TSMC-00-166

It is requested that should Examiner B. Kebede not find that the Claims are now Allowable that he call the undersigned at 989-686-3462 to overcome any problems preventing allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas R. Schnabel, Reg. No. 47,927